

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 6, 1969.

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Citrus Industry Organization Act Amendment,
Footwear Regulation,
Land Valuers Licensing,
Licensing Act Amendment,
Textile Products Description Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS**RAILWAYS INSTITUTE**

Mr. **VIRGO**: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question about a sum being made available to the Railways Department for the purpose of replacing the Railways Institute?

The Hon. G. G. **PEARSON**: The honourable member, on October 14, referred to an advance to the Commissioner in lieu of replacement of the institute buildings and asked whether there had been a financial contribution to the Railways Department for that specific purpose. I replied that the Government had not proposed any monetary advance to the Commissioner in that form but that it was proceeding to a decision as soon as possible on the matter of replacement of the buildings. In my statement on the Loan Estimates I had informed members that the replacement would be necessary at the Government's expense. The Government must see that the institute building is demolished and alternative accommodation provided at Government expense if the festival hall project is to proceed. However, the cost of replacement would constitute a project requiring a Public Works Committee inquiry before it was lawful to make a specific appropriation of money for that purpose, and accordingly no specific appropriation was sought in the recent Loan Estimates.

However, the provision made for the Railways Department will in the aggregate be, in my opinion and that of the Railways Commissioner, sufficient to meet the necessary payments during 1969-70 for these purposes. We had thought earlier that possibly up to \$500,000 might be required for the purpose and that it could be made available without curtailing other necessary projects (I am referring to the expenditure proposed for this year, not to

the total amount). The present expectation is that, as the arrangements may involve providing some temporary accommodation pending construction, the actual funds required for construction during 1969-70 will be considerably less than \$500,000. The main construction expenditure is likely to impinge on 1970-71 accounts.

RAILWAY HOUSES

Mr. **McANANEY**: The Auditor-General's Report states that 387 railway houses were vacant at June 30, 1969, and that, in view of the lengthy periods that these houses had been unoccupied, more of them should be sold. Will the Attorney-General obtain from the Minister of Roads and Transport a report indicating whether any of these houses have been sold?

The Hon. **ROBIN MILLHOUSE**: I will do that.

Mr. **RYAN**: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my recent question about the sale of Railways Department houses?

The Hon. G. G. **PEARSON**: The honourable member previously directed this question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, seeking information about unoccupied Railways Department houses in his district. My colleague replied that such houses as had become redundant for railway purposes had been purchased by the trust, and that the Railways Department had disposed of 20 surplus dwellings in the metropolitan area, the last as recently as January this year. I can now only confirm that with the following report from the General Manager of the Housing Trust:

In the past the trust has purchased houses in the metropolitan area from the South Australian Railways and will consider any further approach from this department.

MARANANGA SCHOOL

Mrs. **BYRNE**: The Minister of Education will be aware that, when speaking in the Budget debate, to the first line, on September 24 and again in the Estimates debate on October 9, followed by a question I asked in the House on October 21, I referred to the Education Department's proposals to transfer the head teacher from the Marananga Primary School. I have now received from the parents and committee members connected with this school a petition requesting that the Minister's decision be reconsidered. As this petition is not in the prescribed form to enable me to present it to Parliament, will the Minister,

if I present the petition to her personally, reconsider her previous decision?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I recall the honourable member's raising this matter in the debates and in the question to which she has referred. There would have been good reasons why the parents' request was turned down and, of course, matters of promotion and things of that nature are decided by me on the advice of Education Department officers. However, to refresh my memory (I just cannot recall all the details contained in the letter that I wrote), I will re-examine the matter and bring down a report.

BUILDING SOCIETY

Mr. RYAN: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked some time ago about registering a building society at Port Adelaide?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Public Actuary has communicated with the Black Diamond Building Society's solicitor for clarification of one of the proposed rules. Upon receipt of this information, it is expected that the society will be registered.

WATER PUMPING

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the pumping of Murray River water?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Pumping for the Mannum-Adelaide main commenced on August 23 at the rate of two pumps off peak, representing 173,000,000 gallons a week. This was varied on October 22 to two pumps on peak and further varied on October 25 to three pumps on peak, representing 371,000,000 gallons a week. Today this was reduced to two pumps on peak, representing 266,000,000 gallons a week, and it is expected that this level of pumping will continue until late in December.

SPEED LIMITS

Mr. CLARK: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to a question I asked a few weeks ago about a request made to me by the Salisbury Branch of the Amalgamated Engineering Union that consideration be given to imposing a speed limit of 45 miles an hour on the section of the Main North Road between Frost Road and Stanbell Road as a result of increased shopping activity in that area?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The existing speed limits on the Main North Road were fixed about five or six years ago, and as a con-

sequence are currently being reviewed. The development at Salisbury referred to has only just been opened up, and it will be necessary to give detailed study to the speed limits and form of control for the intersections abutting the development. The request of the Amalgamated Engineering Union will be taken into consideration in determining any change of control which may be necessary on this section of road.

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on October 29 about implementing the increased speeds of trucks prior to the coming harvest?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: In August, the Joint Advisory Committee on Motor Transport presented what it termed Stage 1 of its report. Cabinet considered the report in early September and approved the recommendation of the Minister of Roads and Transport that the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1967, be amended to allow all commercial motor vehicles to travel under new speed limits. The committee's recommendation with regard to the new speed limits in South Australia have been approved by the Government and are as follows:

Gross vehicle weight (including trailer)	Speed limit miles an hour
Up to 3 tons	60
Over 3 tons and up to 11 tons	50
Over 11 tons	40

These speed limits are to apply except where a speed limit or zone establishes a lower speed limit (for example, 35 miles an hour in a municipality, town or township). These new speeds will apply to all commercial motor vehicles irrespective of the date of the first registration, but the Government recognizes that the adoption of higher commercial vehicle speed limits must be accompanied by amendments to the South Australian braking requirements which will bring them into line with the Australian Motor Vehicle Standards Committee's regulations. It is necessary to link the operative dates of new commercial vehicle speed limits with alterations to the braking requirements, but it is necessary to amend the Road Traffic Act in respect of speed limits although the introduction of the braking requirements is a matter for amendment to regulations under the Road Traffic Act.

The Government is most anxious to introduce these new speed limits, but recognizes that it is necessary to amend the regulations and to allow time for them to be considered by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation

before going on with any amendments to the Act. The regulations are at present being considered by the Crown Solicitor, and it is expected that they will be placed before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation soon. When these are approved, action will be taken to introduce the necessary amending legislation to vary the maximum speeds of commercial vehicles as set out.

CIVIL MARRIAGES

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the provision of facilities for civil marriages at Whyalla?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Commonwealth Attorney-General has been asked to authorize a person to perform civil marriages at Whyalla, and advice has been received that he is considering the matter. An appointment is hoped to be made shortly. The honourable member will appreciate that, as this matter now comes under the control of the Commonwealth Attorney-General and not under my control, we will have to wait on him.

SEX EDUCATION

Mr. BROOMHILL: I refer to paragraph 34 on page 5 of the report of the Select Committee on the Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill, as follows:

The committee draws attention to the recommendations in the submission of Professor Cox with regard to family planning (question 146, paragraphs 3d, 3e, and 3f), sterilization and sex education. It strongly recommends that consideration should be given to action on these matters along the lines suggested by him.

Professor Cox suggested that, at the same time as Parliament was considering the Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill, the Government should act on the question of sex education. Can the Attorney-General say what action he intends to take in this matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Cabinet has felt that we should await the outcome of the debate on this matter of abortion and the fate of the Bill before taking positive action. The matters referred to by the honourable member, as set out in the Select Committee's report, are being considered.

MARGARINE

Mr. CASEY: Last week, I asked the Premier a question regarding the margarine Bill which the Government had drafted and which it intends to introduce soon. I understand that the margarine Bill recently introduced in Queensland has been withdrawn. Has the Premier a reply to my question?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: A draft Bill to amend the Margarine Act has been prepared and, following discussions with the South Australian Dairymen's Association and local representatives of the table margarine industry, consideration is now being given to its introduction.

PENSIONERS' SPECTACLES

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of October 30 about the supply of spectacles to pensioners in country areas?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Some time ago the Australian Medical Association (South Australian Branch) wrote to the Minister for Health, Canberra, requesting an amendment to the National Health Act to provide for an extension to the pensioner medical service so that specialists providing services to pensioners may be reimbursed at specialist rates. Approval of this request would enable the provision of free spectacles to pensioners in country areas when the spectacles had been prescribed by properly qualified medical practitioners. The Chief Secretary wrote to the Minister for Health on October 14, pointing out the Government's interest in this matter and asking whether a decision in the matter could be expedited. No answer has yet been received to that letter.

PARADISE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. JENNINGS: On October 28, I asked the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, a question about water pressure in Paradise and Campbelltown and handed him a petition that had been signed by 275 residents. I had hoped that, by this time, the Minister would have a reply, but apparently he does not have one yet. Since then, I have been interviewed by a lady who had not signed the petition. Incidentally, if the Minister had inspected the petition, he would have noticed that most of the petitioners came from the suburb of Paradise (although in respect of water pressure they are not in Paradise) and only a few from Campbelltown. This lady, who comes from Campbelltown, did not know the contents of the petition. I showed her the extract from *Hansard* and said, "We will have to wait until the Minister has had a chance of having the matter investigated properly before we pursue it any further." She said that she had complained to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and that a departmental engineer who had eventually been sent out had explained to her that the pressure in this area had been reduced permanently because it had been considered to be too high previously. She

said, "This means that we cannot have the tap in the garden running at the same time as we have a shower." He said, "I'm sorry, but that's the position." She said, "If I cannot go any further, I'll see my M.P. about it." He said, "You can do that if you like, but I assure you that it won't make any difference." The lady did not like that, and I do not like it either because, although I realize that we might be rather impotent, I do not like being told that by public servants. This is not the first such case I have heard of recently, and in one case I had to defend two Ministers. Will the Minister of Lands expedite the investigations he undertook to make last week and ascertain whether the water pressure in this area has been permanently reduced?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I examined the petition that the honourable member gave me on October 28. My immediate reaction was that things must be "pretty crook" if there was not water pressure in Paradise. However, I gave the petition to the department for examination, and this examination is being made. I understand that the problem is not an easy one to solve, and that is why nine days has passed without my receiving a report. However, I expect to have a reply fairly soon. In the meantime, I have noted that the honourable member desires to add to the list of petitioners the lady who was told that going to a member of Parliament would not do any good. I can only say that most officers of the department would not use words like that, because officers of the Public Service generally respect the position of members of Parliament and take their complaints seriously. Incidentally, I wonder just what the lady said to provoke the remark by the officer: often we are not given the whole story in these matters. However, the matter is being considered carefully and I will give a fully considered reply to the honourable member as soon as possible.

LOCHIEL ROAD

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to the question I asked last week about work on the Burra-Lochiel road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The investigation into a suitable source of road-making material is almost complete, and it is expected that tenders will be called soon for the crushing of 20,000 cubic yards of base material. It is expected that the council will be able to recommence work, and carry out at least part of the sealing of this section during the current financial year.

PRIME MINISTER

Mr. HUDSON: The people of South Australia are showing much interest in, and concern about, the possible selection in Canberra tomorrow of a new Prime Minister. Rumours have been circulating about the role of the Premier in the matter and his concern that we should have a new Prime Minister who will adopt a better attitude towards South Australia than that adopted by Mr. Gorton. Will the Premier say whether he has been exerting what pressure he can on the Commonwealth members who will vote in the ballot tomorrow, to ensure that the present Prime Minister is not re-elected?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I take it that the honourable member could send a telegram on his own behalf, but I do not know what notice would be taken of it.

PLUSH'S CORNER

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: About two years ago the District Council of Angaston and I made representations for the installation of warning lights at the road-rail crossing at Plush's Corner, near Light Pass, on the Angaston-Stockwell road, but those representations were unsuccessful. Since then, the council has continued discussions with the Road Traffic Board to have this dangerous crossing improved and the board has made certain suggestions. The council considers that the adoption of these suggestions would involve it in land acquisition, as well as the construction of certain roadworks, and that the cost involved would be greater than the cost of a set of warning lights. In a letter to me the district council has pointed out that warning lights at the rail crossing over the Sturt Highway (near Truro), which now serve only one goods train service a week to Truro, are placed on the road where the approaches of both road and rail are in open country and easily visible. Such is not the case at Plush's Corner, where not only does there cross this one goods train per week, but also the daily or twice-daily service to the I.C.I. works at Penrice. Further, the rail approaches to Plush's Corner are well obscured by orchards, etc., as well as being difficult to see because of the angle of the intersection of the road. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to reconsider the matter of warning lights at the dangerous road-rail crossing at Plush's Corner?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to do that.

TENNYSON SEWERAGE

Mr. HURST: For some months I have had many complaints from residents of Tennyson, living immediately north and south of Hillview Avenue in the area bounded by Seaview Road and Military Road, that they have no sewerage facilities. Consequently, they are experiencing great difficulty. Before the Minister of Works became ill I discussed this problem with him and he said he was having the matter investigated. I noticed in the press recently that the Minister had made a statement that the West Lakes scheme would result in sewers being laid in this area much earlier than would otherwise have been the case. Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, obtain a report on this matter so that I may inform my constituents?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will inquire about the existing plans and let the honourable member know as soon as possible.

PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

Mr. LANGLEY: In a letter to the Editor in today's *Advertiser* pre-school education in South Australia was compared with such education in the Australian Capital Territory. It seems that pre-school education centres are provided by the Commonwealth Government in all new housing areas in the A.C.T. The correspondent states that a committee has been formed in Klemzig (a new housing area), but that there is no subsidy forthcoming from the State or the Commonwealth Government for a pre-school centre. Many parents would like to send their children to a pre-school centre, but such a centre is not always available. Many migrant children in the Unley district could benefit from attending a pre-school centre because they have difficulty in speaking English when they start attending an infants school. Can the Minister of Education say whether any subsidy is available for pre-school centres and, if there is not, will she take this matter up in Cabinet or make representations to the Commonwealth Government to see whether something cannot be done to provide such subsidies so that parents may be helped with the early education of their children?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I do not know whether the Commonwealth Government makes itself entirely responsible for pre-school education in the Australian Capital Territory, but it would seem from what the honourable member has said that this could be so. In South Australia the Government makes a considerable

grant through the Minister of Education to the Kindergarten Union of South Australia, whose responsibility it is to allocate these funds as it thinks fit. I do not think there is any doubt that people are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of pre-school education, and this fact is reflected in the extent to which the State Government, to the best of its ability, helps the Kindergarten Union. This also is indicated by the fact that the Commonwealth Government has decided to enter the field of pre-school training and to provide funds for training colleges for teachers engaged in pre-school education. I think it has been said that a child gains 50 per cent of its knowledge in the years up to five years of age, and 30 per cent in the years from five to eight, and this stresses the importance of pre-school education. I believe that the State Government is doing all that it possibly can in this field in South Australia. This may be one of the fields in which the Commonwealth Government will become increasingly involved in the future. I hope that this is so because, like the member for Unley, I should like to see more kindergartens provided in districts in which, at present, parent groups do not qualify for a subsidy from the Kindergarten Union.

INTERMEDIATE COURTS

Mr. EVANS: In the *Advertiser* this morning appears a report concerning the proposed intermediate courts. As this report could create a false impression in the community as to the possible effect and purpose of such courts, will the Attorney-General clarify the position?

The SPEAKER: Before he replies, I hope that the Attorney-General realizes that this matter is still before the House but, because the honourable member said that, as confusion might be caused, the position needed to be clarified, I think I should allow the Attorney-General to reply.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I realize that. The matter to which the honourable member has referred is contained in the report on page 3 of this morning's *Advertiser* in which the special magistrates are reported to be upset by the legislation. I was surprised to read the report and I wish that the magistrates who are dissatisfied with the contents of the Bill had seen me about it—

Mr. Broomhill: It's a pity you didn't discuss it with them beforehand.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —rather than complain to the newspapers. On the point raised by the Opposition member by

interjection, I assure the House that, naturally, the legislation was discussed with the Chief Summary Magistrate, who is in charge of the Adelaide Magistrates Court, and with the Temporary Local Court Judge, who is head of the Local Courts Department, before it was introduced. They have been consulted all along the line.

Mr. Virgo: They have!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I expect that they would have discussed the matters in the Bill with their colleagues. However, if there are matters that the magistrates wish to have clarified I shall be happy to talk to them directly about these matters. Concerning a couple of points made in the report, first may I say that no decisions whatever have been made as to possible appointments, and I am at a complete loss to understand the reference in the newspaper report to two possible appointments from the Crown Law Department. That is absolutely and entirely erroneous. Secondly, I believe that the scheme of legislation will make the magistracy—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that the Attorney-General is going beyond replying to the question. As I pointed out, these matters are contained in a Bill now before the House. The member for Onkaparinga suggested that confusion might be caused by the report, and I agree with the honourable member that the matter should be clarified. However, I have to rule now that this reply is getting beyond that. I will give the Minister permission to make a Ministerial statement, which I think would be the correct thing to do rather than reply to the question. Does the Attorney-General ask leave to make a statement?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

Mr. Virgo: What a Dorothy Dixier!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Onkaparinga told me that he was going to ask a question, but I did not invite it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: With regard to the suggestion in the newspaper that this system will not attract recruits to the magistracy, I believe that it will: indeed, one of the aims of the entire scheme is to do this. I point out that there are certain elements here that are designed to make the magistracy more attractive to members of the legal profession. First, the legislation contemplates the appointment of special justices who will do much of the work now done by magistrates: what we call minor, although important, cases, many

of which are road traffic matters and which are now taken by magistrates. These could be disposed of satisfactorily by special justices. This will relieve the magistrates of a great volume of this work and will allow them to concentrate on many matters which come before them now, which require a knowledge of the law and the experience magistrates have, but with which they hardly have time to deal adequately. This is one way in which we hope to relieve their burden and make the magistracy more attractive.

Secondly, we are providing for the appointment of special senior magistrates, so that within the magistracy itself there will be the chance of promotion. At present there is not, as all the magistrates are on the same footing. Thirdly, we intend that the judges contemplated by the legislation will be drawn at least partly from the ranks of magistrates, both initially and as time goes on, so that there will be the opportunity for magistrates to progress even further. I believe that these three elements will greatly help us recruit legal practitioners to the magistracy and will relieve the great burden that magistrates are carrying at present.

I think that is all I need say to clear up the various points that appeared in the newspaper report today. However, I cannot believe that most magistrates have the opinions suggested by the newspaper report. Some of them may have these opinions, but I hope that any of them who do will see me without delay so that I can discuss the various points of the scheme with them. Further, if they wish to suggest improvements to the scheme, I shall be happy to consider such suggestions. The scheme was discussed with the heads of the two departments over a period of many months, and they greatly influenced the formulation of the scheme.

USED CAR ADVERTISEMENT

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: On a number of mornings recently I have seen an advertisement on television in which a firm, pretending to be a secondhand car dealer, has advertised that it can make money available if a person agrees to trade in his car so that he can then be paid the difference between \$100 and the value of the car, provided he takes another car. It seems to me that this firm is using this advertisement as a gimmick for money-lending purposes. I do not intend to name the person connected with this firm, for two reasons: first, I do not want to be responsible for providing an advertisement for

him; and secondly, I do not want to say something that may do him an injustice. However, if I give the Attorney-General the name of the firm concerned, will he investigate the matter in order to see whether it is operating under false pretences regarding the practices of its salesmen, and whether it is really operating as a money-lender? If it is, will he say whether it is operating in accordance with the Money-Lenders Act?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member gives me the information, I will certainly examine it. I have not seen the advertisement, as I do not often get a chance to look at television.

ELECTORAL ROLLS

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on October 21 about the slow and unsatisfactory delivery of rolls prior to the Commonwealth election?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The roll recently produced was the first joint computer roll printed for a Commonwealth election in South Australia, and in a new form, namely, reduced to 72 per cent of the earlier size and printed on both sides of the page. The honourable member has probably seen that they are much more convenient volumes to handle than were the previous ones. This has been made possible by using new equipment recently installed by the Government Printer. The problem of printing electoral rolls for use at Commonwealth elections is more difficult than for a State election as 300 copies of each of the 119 subdivisions, amounting to over 35,000 copies, have to be produced. Distribution of subdivisional rolls commenced on October 8, 1969, and was completed on October 23, 1969, priority of delivery being given to country areas. In view of the importance of rolls being available at the earliest opportunity, this problem will be kept under constant review, and a reduction of time between writ and availability is expected.

INSECTICIDES

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on October 30 about the Agriculture Department's attitude to the use of D.D.T.?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports that the Agriculture Department has maintained close liaison with both health and trade authorities concerning the possible undesirable side effects arising from the widespread agricultural use of D.D.T. D.D.T. has been banned for use

on animals and birds for the control of external pests for a number of years, these preparations being no longer registered in this State. Its use in agricultural crops and pastures is being phased out as satisfactory alternative chemicals or control methods are being determined. The Agriculture Department recommends against the use of D.D.T. particularly on pastures and crops to be grazed by dairy stock or animals raised for meat production. Its use in horticultural crops is also declining as alternative pest control measures are established and D.D.T. has virtually been removed from the list of chemicals recommended by the department for control of pests of horticultural crops. In the few circumstances where D.D.T. is of necessity used, producers are warned to observe the withholding periods that are specified on the label.

WHYALLA HOUSING

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I understand that during the last six months 304 rental houses in Whyalla have been vacated, although they have since become occupied by tenants. As a consequence of this situation, the waiting time for rental houses can be substantially reduced, but there remains a considerable waiting time for purchase houses. Will the Minister of Housing have this matter examined with a view to seeing whether the Housing Trust's activity in building new rental houses should be decreased and its activity in building purchase houses accelerated, if the examination shows that this is desirable?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall be pleased to do that. The honourable member's comment surprises me somewhat because, as he is aware, recently we were acutely short of all types of accommodation, particularly rental accommodation, in Whyalla. Therefore, the trust's activity was directed particularly towards meeting this need. I think the honourable member appreciates the fact that the trust is providing considerable rental accommodation in the form of terraced pairs and that this activity does not lend itself to great flexibility. If they are terraced pairs for rental accommodation, they are not so readily saleable.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: The trust doesn't sell them anyway, does it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, I do not think it does. These houses are not built for that purpose, anyway. It means that the trust, in order to meet the changed circumstances in Whyalla, must revise its contracting arrangements in order to meet the demand for sale houses, and this is not easy to do. This

morning I saw in the normal monthly statement sent to me by the trust that substantial work had been done in Whyalla, but I did not examine this closely; I presume it related to rental accommodation. However, now that the honourable member has raised the matter I will see at once what is really the purpose. I think that probably it would be a good thing if I spoke to the General Manager on the telephone in the next few minutes, pointing out the honourable member's question so that, if a review of the policy is necessary, some attempt could be made to arrange it. In any case, I will look into the matter at the earliest possible moment.

TAPEROO PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. HURST: A few weeks ago the Minister of Education was good enough to visit the Taperoo Primary School for which parents were advocating the construction of a new building. Since that inspection, I have received a copy of a letter that has been forwarded to the school committee stating a suggested date when work on the new building might be commenced. Can the Minister say whether this project has been referred to the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I do not believe it has. It would now be at the stage where the needs and requirements of the department in relation to this school are being assessed, and we will then see what can be done. I will get a reply as soon as possible, probably early next week.

MAIN NORTH-EAST ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: On October 29, the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, told me that work on the reconstruction and widening of the Main North-East Road beyond Smart Road to Haines Road had been delayed pending the completion of design and land acquisition, and that it was likely to take at least two years for this project to be completed. As I have said previously, because this road is too narrow for present-day traffic, it is a dangerous hazard. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague to consider having the work completed within a shorter time?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

MARINO ROCKS RAIL SERVICE

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my recent question about possible improvements to the train service to Marino Rocks?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague states:

The rail passenger service operating to Marino Rocks and thence to Hallett Cove consists of 11 return trips a day Monday to Friday; eight return trips on Saturdays; and four return trips on Sundays. On week days Marino Rocks patronage averages less than four passengers a train. The maximum number counted joining at Marino Rocks any one train to Adelaide was 13, and alighting from Adelaide 14, and there was no patronage at all on four of the 11 trains in each direction on one day when a random count was made. There is, therefore, no economic justification for additional train services beyond Marino, which is only 30 chains from Marino Rocks and at which station 31 suburban services terminate daily. Nevertheless there is a period between mid-day and 4 p.m. when no service is provided beyond Marino, and to give a better balance I have asked the Railways Commissioner to extend to Hallett Cove one train which at present terminates at Marino. This service will depart Adelaide at 1.40 p.m. and will arrive at Hallett Cove at 2.18 p.m., departing on the return at 2.22 p.m., arriving Adelaide at 3.02 p.m.

POTATO DISEASE

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the potato disease known as phoma?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member would know that the disease gangrene (or phoma) of potatoes is already a proclaimed disease under the provisions of the Vine, Fruit and Vegetable Protection Act. Regulations have also been gazetted providing for strict control over seed potatoes imported into the State. Proclamations and regulations have now been prepared with the object of prohibiting the planting of phoma-affected tubers except under the direction of an inspector, who will also have power to direct the disposal of affected potatoes. The new proclamations and regulations will be submitted for the consideration of Cabinet and Executive Council next week. Meanwhile, a letter has been distributed by the Agriculture Department to all growers known to be holding infected seed advising them of the measures which they should take to prevent the spread of the disease.

USED CAR SALES

Mr. McKEE: Some time ago I asked the Attorney-General whether he would inquire on behalf of a constituent of mine about excess charges made by some secondhand motor car dealers. If he has a reply, I should be pleased if he would give it. However, if he does not

have a reply, will he give some reason for the undue delay in this case, as my constituent is becoming slightly impatient?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not have a reply as yet. I can only apologize to the honourable member for the delay: I cannot explain it. I will follow up the matter, hoping to have a reply on Tuesday.

Mr. RYAN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the sale of secondhand motor vehicles?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Road Traffic Act prescribes that motor vehicles must have certain items of equipment such as mudguards, headlights, tail-lights, flashing turn indicator lights, a warning device, etc. Section 160 of this Act permits a member of the Police Force, when of the opinion that a vehicle, whether exhibited for sale or on the road, does not comply with the requirements of this Act or cannot be driven safely, to direct the owner or person in charge to produce it for examination. If the vehicle is found to be unroadworthy, its use can be restricted until the necessary repairs are made. It is understood that the Joint Advisory Committee on Motor Transport is at present considering the question of the effectiveness of present legislation in relation to the roadworthiness of motor vehicles and that this committee's report on this subject is to be forwarded soon.

CEDUNA POLICE STATION

Mr. EDWARDS: Recently, when I was in the far west of the West Coast, I spoke to the police inspector for the Eyre Peninsula district, who told me that court proceedings were becoming increasingly difficult to carry out in the Ceduna police station because of the smallness of the building and the increased number of cases that had to be dealt with. The office concerned is only small and other police business has to be conducted in the same room as that in which the court is held.

Mr. Burdon: They are crook over there.

Mr. EDWARDS: For the benefit of members opposite, it is not the local people but the travelling public who give the trouble.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member wants to have a conversation I suggest he have it at 7 o'clock this evening.

Mr. EDWARDS: Surely it is out of order for members opposite to interject when I am asking a serious question of this nature.

The SPEAKER: It is the honourable member's duty to ignore interjections. Will the honourable member please ask his question?

Mr. EDWARDS: Will the Premier take this matter up with the Chief Secretary and see whether something can be done to solve this problem, as the local sergeant has said that if something is not done soon he will have to hire the town hall?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am pleased to know that the troublemakers are not coming from this area where law-enforcement resources are being stretched. As I seem to recall a previous discussion concerning a disturbance in this area, I will take this matter up with my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member.

OPALS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Minister of Immigration and Tourism knows that in all cities visited by large numbers of tourists bus trips are organized to show them the most interesting sights available. While in Amsterdam recently, I noticed that every bus load of tourists was taken to a diamond-cutting centre and given information on diamond-cutting and the value of diamonds, samples of which were displayed. This must create considerable interest not only in respect of the tourists but also in the diamond industry. Curiously enough, nothing of this kind is done in South Australia, even though we produce the greatest value of opals in the world, the export value of which in their rough state is at least \$5,000,000 a year. I have repeatedly urged in the House that we should do more for the cutting and polishing of these valuable stones in order to get far greater value in this country as a result of our work. Will the Minister examine the possible establishment of an opal-cutting and polishing centre in Adelaide so that tourists may be taken to it in a similar way to which they are taken to the diamond-cutting centre in Amsterdam? This could have the effect of publicizing opals as gemstones and be a fillip to the tourist industry.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will examine the question, although it seems to me, without having considered it in depth, that it is a field in which private industry should clearly operate. If it is simply a matter of making a suggestion, I will do that. I will have to examine the whole question and see whether some of the local travel agents might not also be interested in this matter. When I have a full report, I will give it to the honourable member without delay.

FIREWOOD

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Eudunda-Morgan railway line was closed recently after having given about 90 years' service to the community in the area, and the Railways Commissioner has now established a co-ordinated transport service to operate between Morgan and Eudunda. This service depends for its economic existence on the kind of backloading the carriers can obtain from Morgan to Eudunda. Hitherto, the principal loading which the railways have transported from Morgan to Adelaide has been firewood, and the Railways Department has provided a transport service at minimal cost to attract the firewood traffic. The new transport charge on the co-ordinated service has resulted in a freight increase of \$1.56 a ton, which must be met by the wood millers. The metropolitan price of firewood is price-controlled at \$13 a ton. As I believe that this is a matter of Government policy, will the Premier say, in view of the substantial savings to the Railways Department as a result of the closure of the Morgan-Eudunda line, what provision is being made to provide a freight subsidy for the wood millers or whether representations are being made to the Prices Commissioner for an increase in the price of firewood to enable the millers to stay in business?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I understand that an approach has been made to the Minister of Roads and Transport as a result of the closing of the freight service in the last few weeks. The closure of the line is the result of the loss of patronage and the economic loss concerned with the operation of such lines as this. The request demonstrates the difficult problems that have grown up around subsidized services, because many of the low freights charged throughout the State are, in essence, direct subsidies to various industries that take advantage of the low freight rates. The alternative is a co-ordinated service operating on rates that must be adjusted to economic realities, and the rate in this case is therefore higher than the rate made possible by the extreme subsidy involved in the previous service. This provides a real problem whether or not the Government can show a subsidy in another way and help an industry that competes with other fields as far as the economics of the consumer are concerned. As the Government is sympathetic, I will consult with my colleague and see what information I can obtain for the honourable member.

JERVOIS BRIDGE

Mr. RYAN: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of October 30 about work on the Jervois bridge?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Some unforeseen difficulties are at present being experienced by the contractor in the demolition of the old Jervois bridge, particularly in the removal of the old piles. This will have the effect of delaying work under the contract. At present, it appears that, although all contract work will not be completed until next year, the full width of the new bridge will be available to traffic prior to Christmas. The nature of the work at present is such that a large work force cannot be employed, and this is perhaps giving the appearance that not much activity is in progress. Although it will be appreciated that the Highways Department is not able effectively to control progress of the contractor, present progress is generally satisfactory.

POLICE STATIONS

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I appreciate the mighty job that police officers in one-man police stations perform, but a constituent of mine rang me to say that he had not produced his driver's licence within the prescribed time to a one-man police station he had nominated. On the three occasions he visited the station there was a notice saying that the officer would be out until a certain time, and each time he went back there was a notice stating a different time. Although I know such absences are unavoidable, will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether such notices could indicate another station to which the inquirer could go?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have run into a similar problem myself and I think on that occasion there was a notice stating that the licence could be pushed under the door or left somewhere on the premises; possibly it could be put into a letterbox. On the other hand, the notice could give the name of another station to which the inquirer could go. I will take this matter up with my colleague.

GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. LANGLEY: For many years it has been planned that Greenhill Road should be widened from Anzac Highway to Fullarton Road. Two sections have been completed and preliminary work has started in an easterly direction from Goodwood Road. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of

Roads and Transport whether this new section will extend as far as Glen Osmond Road and, if it will not, what section will be completed in this stage of the plan?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will do that.

ANGLE PARK TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. JENNINGS: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Education about the caretaker at the Angle Park Boys Technical High School (he was also the caretaker of the Angle Park Girls Technical High School). It seemed he was being grossly underpaid because he was not only the cleaner (he had to bring his wife in to help him do the necessary cleaning work) but also the caretaker in an area where many people from surrounding districts come in to make a nuisance of themselves. This person had to ring the police day and night to get protection for Education Department property. At that time I told the Minister that, in addition to his departmental pay, the caretaker was paid \$10 from school funds. The Minister did not answer my question in the House because there was an adjournment, but she wrote to me about the matter and said that the caretaker, who was employed for 48 hours a week, received \$48 from the department and that nothing could be done to increase that remuneration. Will the Minister take this matter up to see whether this remuneration is remotely adequate for a person who not only works 48 hours a week cleaning but has a supervisory activity over the whole school because he lives adjacent to it and is responsible, and feels himself responsible, for the care of the property?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: From the information given, it seems that the caretaker lives a very full life. I recall having written to the honourable member about this during the Royal Show adjournment, but I cannot remember all the details I gave. I will have another look at it and let the honourable member have a reply next week.

SCENIC HIGHWAYS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to the question I asked on October 30 concerning scenic highways?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The development of tourist roads as declared under the Planning and Development Act is not being treated as a special project, and no funds are being specifically allocated for such purpose. The roads are rather being treated

in the same manner as all other roads in that they form an intrinsic part of the overall road system. The fact that the declaration of these roads can induce heavy tourist traffic on particular sections would provide justification by the local government authority concerned to make application for grant assistance for improvements that may be necessary. In these cases, and as the funds available for roadworks are limited, it would be necessary for the local government authority to list the work in order of priority in relation to other road needs of the area. Whether or not grant assistance would be provided would depend largely on the priority allocated by the local government authority. The Range Road near Houghton comes within this category, and improvements to the road have not as yet been given high priority by the council.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Mr. VIRGO: I understand the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, has a reply to the question I asked on October 8 about railway crossings at Oaklands and Parkholme?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I was embarrassed about this matter because both—

Mr. Virgo: You don't look it!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am often embarrassed: I am sensitive.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Attorney-General should remain insensitive.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Still, I want to do the right thing by all members.

The SPEAKER: That would be pretty difficult.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Very difficult indeed. No-one appreciates that more than you do, I know Sir, with your strict impartiality.

Mr. Virgo: What about my reply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have it, but both the member for Glenelg and the member for Edwardstown asked the same question and I did not know to whom to give the reply. After much consideration I thought it would cause less trouble on the other side if I gave it to the member for Edwardstown. It is as follows:

Planning investigations for rail-road grade separations at Oaklands Park and Parkholme are proceeding. The engagement of consultants at this time for further planning work is not feasible as the two proposals have already reached an advanced stage. However, consideration will be given to the appointment of consultants for the preparation of detailed designs after the projects have been approved in principle.

BUS STOPS

Mr. HURST: I had a telephone call today from an irate constituent complaining about the location of a bus stop in front of his premises which, he says, deprives his customers of parking facilities. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what authority is responsible for the location of Municipal Tramway Trust bus stops?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

MERRITON CROSSING

Mr. VENNING: Some time ago, probably soon after I became a member, I asked a question about the installation of warning lights at the Merriton railway crossing. Every day a large volume of traffic uses this crossing, which is on the main road to Woomera, and the installation of flashing lights should be considered so that traffic will not have to halt when it arrives at the railway line. Will the Attorney-General again ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to consider providing a flashing light system at this crossing, and will he find out the cost of this work?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will seek the information.

GOODWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Several weeks ago I referred to the intention to pave the Goodwood Primary School grounds. When I visited the school yesterday with a member of the school committee, the playground was overcrowded. Playing games in the grounds is becoming hazardous because of the condition of the paving. Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, expedite this work?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will take up this matter and give the honourable member a reply as soon as possible.

SOLOMONTOWN BEACH

Mr. McKEE: Has the Treasurer a reply to my question about the retaining wall at Solomontown beach?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, but I will try to get a reply by Tuesday.

GOODWOOD ROAD

Mr. VIRGO: My question is directed to the Attorney-General, both as the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government and, more important, because Goodwood Road is the boundary of our districts. I refer him to the Annual Report of the Garden Suburb Commissioner, which the Attorney-General may not, in his busy life, have had

time to read but which I have read because I am not so busy. The Commissioner states:

Landscape beautification of the Goodwood Road median strip, and the park areas at the northern and southern entrances to the suburb, has not been proceeded with by the Highways Department. When Goodwood Road reconstruction was commenced in 1967 it involved the removal of some 120 varying trees . . .

I am sure the Attorney agrees that some beautiful trees went under the axe when this work was done. The Commissioner continues: . . . and, fearing public protests which were current at the time, the Garden Suburb Commissioner was asked to assist the department by advising any persons inquiring that it was intended to replant the areas as part of the work of road reconstruction.

However, the department has not proceeded with this work and, as a result, we still have no trees. Will the Attorney-General take up this matter with his colleague urgently, as we still have a few weeks within which to plant trees this year and so avoid a delay of another 12 months, with a view to restoring Goodwood Road to the beautiful highway that it once was?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Although I appreciate the honourable member's acknowledgement that I lead a busy life, I assure him that, as the Garden Suburb Commissioner's report deals with an extremely important part of my district, I made it my duty to go through the report, before I laid it on the table of the House, and I saw the statement to which the honourable member has referred, but I must admit that I have not taken any action on the matter. However, now that the honourable member has made what I think is a good suggestion, I will certainly take up the matter with the Minister.

PELICAN POINT

Mr. HURST: The Natural History Society of South Australia Incorporated, a body concerned with preserving the landscape and beauty of various areas throughout the State, wrote to the Port Adelaide council (and I have a copy of the letter), suggesting that the sandhill area north and south of the old Outer Harbour road should be preserved from complete destruction. The society points out that this area is the last refuge of the native vegetation, lizards, and birds of LeFevre Peninsula. The society considers that the area should be preserved as a sanctuary. Will the Minister of Lands confer with the State Planning Office and consider complying with the society's request?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will consult the State Planning Office and let the honourable member know what is the position.

PORT PIRIE SEWERAGE

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, a reply to my question about sewerage work at Port Pirie?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Today in Executive Council the Governor referred to the Public Works Committee the whole matter of sewerage at Port Pirie. The project is large, and the honourable member knows that there are engineering problems regarding sewage disposal requiring much negotiation and study, including a visit to Port Pirie by the Minister of Works, and discussions with the council on details of the scheme and the method of rating. The project, if approved, will be a signal advance for Port Pirie, both industrially and in making the city a more pleasant place in which to live.

STURT RIVER

Mr. VIRGO: Concern has been expressed to me for some time by people living adjacent to the Sturt River, and I am sure the member for Glenelg would have received similar complaints, as this river is the boundary between our districts. At present, a new course of the Sturt River is being constructed and the excavations have created many mounds of dirt 20ft. or 30ft. high. These are unsightly and unpleasant in the winter, but in the summer, particularly when work is proceeding, they will cause a dust nuisance. As these mounds will be shifted eventually, will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, ensure that the work of removing this excess dirt is expedited so that local residents will not be subjected to the man-made dust storms that they have had to suffer for the last two summers?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will find out what is involved, and inform the honourable member.

MOSQUITOES

Mr. RYAN: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Marine many questions about the mosquito nuisance that affected the upper reaches of the Port River. The Minister promised to see what was being done and to tell me when the eradication process would begin. Although there has not yet been much summer, there have been some warm days, and I have received many complaints about mosqui-

toes from people living near this area, who have expressed fears that this year will possibly be one of the worst years the district has known. As I understand the Treasurer, representing the Minister of Marine, has further information, will he give it to me?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member set out the problem at some length in his question of October 9. At present, mosquito breeding areas in the Port Adelaide and Salisbury areas are being marked for insecticidal and larval control, which will commence on November 17, 1969, and continue through the summer months. It is estimated that 600 acres of swamp area will require to be treated five or six times during the summer season.

CHIROPRACTORS

Mr. LANGLEY: Two chiropractors living in the Unley District, who have heard that the Government intends to amend the Chiropractic Act, have spoken to me because they are interested in these amendments. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Health whether representatives of the council to which these people belong will be able to give evidence to the Minister before these amendments are introduced so that they can put their point of view?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will consult my colleague.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Automatic Data Processing Centre Extensions,

Highbury Primary School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CHIROPODISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 6, line 29 (clause 8)—Leave out "prescribed rate" and insert "maximum rate, fixed by the Reserve Bank of Australia, appropriate to the term for which the society proposes to invest the moneys".

No. 2. Page 20, line 32 (clause 8)—Leave out "; or rate of interest."

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2:

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 and 2 be agreed to.

The Bill had provided in new section 246 that moneys from trust accounts should be deposited in a bank of the practitioner's choice and that the interest to be paid on these moneys should be at a prescribed rate. The Associated Banks have pointed out that the prescribed rate could be higher than that permitted to private banks by the Reserve Bank of Australia and, therefore, the wording has to be altered. Both amendments give effect to that requirement.

Mr. CORCORAN: As I agree with the Attorney-General that the amendments are desirable, there is no opposition to their acceptance.

Amendments agreed to.

PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF WATERS BY OIL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 21. Page 2313.)

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the Bill, which, though simple, is important. As a result of the abolition of the Harbors Board, several amendments are necessary to this Act. I do not want to talk about several other amendments made by the Bill, for they are necessary as a result of the change to decimal currency. Having examined these amendments, I find that, although the wording is changed, no variation has been made in the penalties provided. There are two provisions of substance in the Bill that are desirable. The first is in clause 5, which amends section 9 and makes it necessary to provide that an entry shall be made in the records forthwith upon the occurrence of any event or circumstance of which, or in relation to which, an entry is required by the regulations. I believe this is most necessary. Having had some experience in

this matter, I am sure that it will be easier to obtain a conviction under the new provision.

Previously the Act stated that the master and the agent of a ship were responsible for a breach. The Bill adds the owner, providing that if the regulations are not complied with the owner, the agent and the master shall each be guilty of an offence against the section. I am glad this provision has been made because, when I was Minister of Marine, often, when we would like to have prosecuted, the Crown Law Department told us it would be most difficult to sustain a prosecution because the defence would be used that the master or agent was acting under the instructions of the owner.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: This is the second amendment on the subject. The first amendment was to include the agent, and this amendment includes the owner.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That is so. Another clause provides for a regulation to be made restricting the carriage by any ship or class of ship of water in tanks that have contained oil. Thus a ship can be prevented from taking on water ballast which, when discharged, would be contaminated with oil and would cause damage to shore areas and to marine life and which in some cases would make swimming at our beaches almost impossible. I believe this important provision will do much to prevent cost being incurred by the State and by individuals, and will prevent the unpleasantness that has occurred on previous occasions owing to the discharge of oil. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

BUILDERS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 21. Page 2312.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I oppose the Bill. I believe that it is designed to make the Builders Licensing Act virtually unworkable and to ensure that the protection intended to be provided under the Act for the general public will, in effect, not be provided. The Minister in his second reading explanation said:

Government members agree, and I think have never contested, either when in Government or in Opposition, that it is desirable that protection be afforded and that steps be taken accordingly to prevent malpractices from occurring. The method that was considered and adopted by the Parliament of the day was that builders should be licensed and registered

by a board. As that purpose has been completely preserved in the Bill, the protection that it was sought to provide will apply.

In fact, the purpose has not been completely preserved in the Bill. This is not a matter of interpretation but of clear statement because clause 16 provides, in effect, that most tradesmen will not require a restricted licence: only when they do work costing more than \$500 do they need to be licensed. Clause 16 also provides that a builder does not need to be licensed to construct a house or dwelling for another person who indicates that the house or dwelling is for his own personal use and occupation. So, whenever a builder negotiates a direct contract with an individual who gives notice or informs the builder in writing that the house or dwelling is intended for his personal use or occupation, he does not need to be licensed. The clause does not even require the builder to tell the prospective house owner that he does not hold a builder's licence. There is no requirement that that be undertaken: so, in the area where the greatest protection is needed, it is not provided.

I am not sure what the administrative and legal consequences will be of effectively exempting all tradesmen from the requirement of obtaining a restricted licence, because in most cases the painting work, the plastering work and the carpentry work would each cost less than \$500.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Oh no!

Mr. HUDSON: Yes! The Minister may say, "Oh no!"

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The honourable member can say, "Oh yes," too. He knows he is wrong.

Mr. HUDSON: That is not so because, as the Minister (if he cares to check) will find, there are many cases where carpentry work carried out on a house would be less than \$500. If I can demonstrate that the carpentry work, the plastering work and the painting work required in relation to a house cost less than \$500 each, will the Minister move to delete this provision from the Bill? What the provision does is to provide that a builder must be licensed unless he has a letter from the prospective house owner who is purchasing the house direct from the builder saying that he will use it himself. If the work to be carried out by any tradesman is worth less than \$500, he does not have to be licensed. Indeed, the builder can get around it completely because there is nothing to say that he must use only one carpenter on the house: he could break the carpentry

work into two separate subcontracts if he wanted to use unlicensed tradesmen, and the Minister cannot deny this could be done.

What clause 16 does is to open it up completely and ensure that anyone who cannot get a licence and who does not have the necessary competence in order to get a licence as a general builder or restricted licence can still remain in business. I must assume that that is the Bill's purpose, when it is a clearly manifest result of the Bill. Is there anything to prevent a builder from employing one carpenter to do the flooring work and another carpenter to do the other carpentry work on a house?

Mr. Virgo: One carpenter could do the first fixings and another carpenter could do the second fixings; this would split up the \$500.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and the Minister would have to admit that in that case the carpenters employed, even if the builder has to be licensed, do not have to be licensed.

Mr. Rodda: Are you talking about building a doll's house?

Mr. HUDSON: I know that the member for Victoria has a grand office in his doll's house along with the Premier but, if he cannot understand the argument I have presented, I think he had better consider the matter further because it is clear that the consequences of passing the Bill will be to ensure that a builder can remain in work without having to hold a general builder's licence and that a tradesman can continue to operate or can enter a field any time without being licensed. If these loop-holes are found in the Bill (and they stick out a mile), they will be used.

Mr. Broomhill: Perhaps that is what the member for Victoria wants to happen.

Mr. HUDSON: That may be the case.

Mr. Rodda: You're not very charitable.

Mr. HUDSON: It is difficult to be charitable when one sees legislation which was supposedly designed to protect the ordinary member of the public and those builders and tradesmen who carry out work of a required standard but which contains deliberate loop-holes. What answer has the Minister to my question with respect to clause 16 (b) which does not even require an unlicensed builder to tell the prospective home buyer that he is unlicensed? There is nothing in this clause, as it stands, that will require such notice. What protection then is there for the home owner? The builder just goes along to the prospective home owner and says, "I need for

certain purposes a letter from you saying that you are going to use this house for your own personal use and occupation and, if I have that letter, I shall be able to do certain things that will enable the house to be cheaper for you." The home buyer will sign the letter: why should he not sign? There is nothing to tell him that if he signs it he signs away his rights to have a licensed builder do the work on his house, but that is what he is doing.

The Minister of Housing had the gall to say in his second reading explanation that the purpose (protecting the home owner) was completely preserved in the Bill, that the protection the Act sought to apply will apply. That is simply not the case, and the whole purpose of clause 16 of the Bill in particular is to ensure that the ordinary builder who is not competent can still get a licence; that those who wish to enter the business but who are not competent to do so can still enter it; and that a real estate agent who wishes to set himself up in the building business can still do that without being licensed and can employ tradesmen who have no restricted licence. There is no possible way this Government can honestly say it is genuinely attempting to protect the home owner and the general standards of the competent builder if this legislation is passed. Manifestly, the legislation is aimed at creating loopholes and ensuring by so doing that shoddy standards in certain sections of the building industry will be continued.

Further, the Government, by means of this Bill, has canned altogether the advisory committee. Why? It has never given the advisory committee a chance to work. What is the licensing board going to do when it needs to consider the necessary qualifications that a tradesman should have in order to get a restricted licence or the necessary qualifications that the builder should have in order to get a general building licence, because these regulations have to be prescribed? No doubt it will appoint committees because it will have to seek advice from people who are in the business. The advisory committee has been scrapped, in my opinion, because the Minister of Housing and the Government that represents South Australia at present does not in any circumstances want advice from people who are involved in the appropriate trade unions, even though the principal Act lays down clearly that this is only advice and that the advisory committee is to comprise not just representatives of trade unions and employer organizations but also independent

people. Even though all that is true, and even though it is expressly provided in the principal Act that the advisory committee is only acting in an advisory capacity, the Government is not willing to give the advisory committee a trial: it is cutting it out altogether simply because it has a doctrinaire view and considers that the representatives of the tradesmen should not be consulted. What were we told by the Minister in his second reading explanation about the advisory committee? He said:

Paragraphs (e), (f) and (g) remove from the section any reference to the advisory committee which, the Government considers, is a body that is unnecessary for the proper or efficient administration of the Act.

That is all we are told. Why? Surely the board must take advice on these matters. Why is the advisory committee not necessary? Why cannot the advisory committee, particularly in relation to appropriate qualifications to be applied in any trade or the qualifications for a general builder's licence, perform that function properly and adequately? Does the Minister suggest that the advisory committee could be dominated by the trade union representatives? Does he suggest that, if the board is confronted with a disagreement between the employer and the employee representatives, it will automatically adopt the employee's point of view, that it is not capable of making a decision between the two? Does he suggest that it is not capable of referring the matter back to the advisory committee and saying, "We are not satisfied with the advice you have tendered on this matter. We want an agreed point of view and we want the matter reconsidered"? Is not the board capable of rejecting advice from the advisory committee if representatives of employers and employees get together and make things too restrictive?

I think it is a disgrace and an insult to this Parliament that a Minister can get up and introduce a Bill that does away with an advisory committee, and say in his second reading explanation that it is a body that is unnecessary for the proper or efficient administration of the Act. The Minister knows that without an advisory committee the board itself will have to appoint committees to deal with problems and that even an advisory committee would have to consider the appointment of committees to deal with specific trades when it had no direct knowledge of those trades. The provision for the appointment of committees of the advisory committee was specifically set out in regulations approved by this Parliament.

The fact that the Minister will not explain this matter indicates that he and the Government do not consider that any advisory committee that has, in part, equal representation from employers and trade unions is a proper body. What other possible conclusion can we reach? Surely the board will not be required to perform all the functions of the advisory committee, and surely those persons in the industry have a right to be consulted. Why was this right taken out of the original legislation? If this matter dealt with primary producers, the 16 cow cockies that make up part of the Government would not agree to the people in the industry not having the right to be consulted.

Mr. Edwards: Who are the 16 cow cockies?

Mr. HUDSON: I will not name them for the honourable member: that is just a descriptive phrase. The Minister knows that in primary production matters his Party would tell him that there must be direct primary-producer representation. All boards dealing with such interests have that direct representation, yet in this measure the Government denies it. The Government is prejudiced and is not considering the matter fairly, because the original Bill did not provide for a board dominated by industry interests but for one comprising mostly independent people, conferring with representatives of the industry who had a right to be heard. It seems that this Government has a double standard. If it is protecting a primary-producing industry, direct representation on the board is the principle.

Mr. Venning: Rubbish!

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Rocky River knows the score. Would he support the removal of the producers from the Citrus Organization Committee?

Mr. McAnaney: That's a marketing board.

Mr. HUDSON: All Government members know that, when a primary-producing industry is being considered, one of the Government's main concerns is to ensure that there are producer representatives on the board and that the primary producer has a right not only to consultation but to participation. When this matter was first brought before Parliament—

Mr. McAnaney: This does not control the marketing of houses.

Mr. HUDSON: It is controlling the production of something, and that something happens to be not a primary product.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: When the Bill was first brought before Parliament—

Mr. HUDSON: When the Bill was introduced (I am making this speech)—

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: —there was no provision for an advisory board.

Mr. HUDSON: That is right, as I will point out. When the Bill was first introduced the industry interests, on both the employer and the trade union sides, were given direct representation on the board and when that arrangement was criticized, rightly in my opinion, a change was made and an independent board was provided for. The Minister may smile.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I know what happened. I was at the conference, and everything else.

Mr. HUDSON: The Minister has a bad memory, because the advisory committee was provided for well before the conference was held. The whole composition of the board had been changed well before the conference was held.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes, but there was a compromise arrangement.

Mr. HUDSON: It was a correct arrangement, regardless of whether it was a compromise, because I do not consider that those directly involved in an industry have a right to control that industry: they may neglect the interests of the people whom they should serve. That principle applies whether the industry concerned is involved in primary production or in secondary production. However, I consider that those involved in an industry have a right to be heard and consulted, even if they are trade unionists, whereas the Minister does not believe that.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What do you believe?

Mr. Virgo: We've told you.

Mr. HUDSON: We established the advisory committee to ensure that interests associated with the industry had a right to be consulted and to have their opinions considered. The Minister does not believe in that. He says, "You must not consult those trade unionists."

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Don't sneer about it here.

Mr. HUDSON: How else can I act, when you introduce a Bill of this kind and take out the right to consultation, whereas you would not do that in relation to any primary industry, and your Party would not allow it? Of course I will sneer. Every Government member should demand an explanation.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I'll give you one.

Mr. HUDSON: It will have to be better than we've heard by way of interjection this afternoon.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You had better put up a better case than you've submitted this afternoon, too.

Mr. HUDSON: The case is perfectly adequate. If we are concerned about standards in an industry and about the way a product will be produced and marketed, the principle that must apply is that the interests directly concerned with the industry should have the right not to dominate but to be consulted, and that right, which was provided for in the Act, is now to be taken away.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Don't you accuse me of being entirely unsympathetic to trade unions, and don't sneer about it. You've no right to say that.

Mr. HUDSON: I have every right to say it when you and your Cabinet are taking out of the Act the right of consultation.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: There's no member on your side who has been here as long as I have who will back you up honestly in that statement.

Mr. HUDSON: All right. Why have you taken out the right of consultation? Why do you apply a double standard?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I don't.

Mr. HUDSON: You do, because you would not make this change in relation to a primary industry, and you know that. You would not be allowed to do it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must address the Chair and, if he refers to another member of this Chamber, he must not refer to him as "you". The honourable member must refer to the Minister of Housing as "the honourable Minister".

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable Minister would not be allowed by members of his Party to do this on a primary industry matter, and every member of his Party knows that that statement is true, yet the provision is being taken out of the Act in this case. A further watering down involved in this Bill relates to the definitions. We are now to have a definition of "building" that will remove any prefabricated buildings not intended for residential purposes. That is not quite the effect of clause 4. It removes from the list of buildings to be covered by the Builders Licensing Board any building consisting only or mainly of assembled prefabricated metal sections or any timber frame building where, in either case, such building is not intended for residential purposes. A

timber frame building may not be prefabricated: all it has to be is timber frame and then it is not covered if it is for other than residential purposes. Why? The Government says it is interested in building standards, yet it says, "Well, it doesn't matter how it is erected if it is to be used as a factory and it is timber frame." Apparently, it does not have to be of a standard, and anyone can put it up. What is wrong with this Government's standards? Does not the Government care about the standard of factory buildings?

Mr. Casey: Or any building, for that matter.

Mr. HUDSON: Of course. People work in factories, or has not the Government heard the good news? Why should not factories be of a decent standard and erected by someone who is competent? Why should we have to suffer the blight of factory buildings which are unsightly and which begin to deteriorate and fall down, because of incompetence, after some years? We should examine some of the factory buildings erected in the centre of Adelaide in years gone by and ask ourselves whether they are a credit to the reputation of South Australia and of Adelaide. We should carefully examine the nature of buildings in this city, and those in every town and city throughout South Australia.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Councils have a constant problem in this direction, too.

Mr. HUDSON: Of course, but they say that once a building is erected it is difficult to get it down. We know that the powers of councils in this matter are limited and should be strengthened. If any Government member can say that we have every right to be proud of the standard of buildings in the commercial and factory areas throughout South Australia, then his standards are shocking. I think this attitude is appalling. The Government is saying that if someone wants to go into business and, to lessen the capital cost, erects a shoddy building, that is all right, and it does not really matter. A bigger profit will result because less money has been invested, although the conditions under which people will have to work in that building will be worse, but in all probability—

Mr. Venning: This is only what you are saying.

Mr. HUDSON: —the businessman who does it on the cheap does not gain by so doing, because his employees know that he is that kind of businessman, so the morale is poorer and he does not receive co-operation from his employees.

Mr. Venning: It is in his own interest to have a decent building.

Mr. HUDSON: Then why not provide that, no matter what sort of building it is, it must be put up by a licensed builder? Why provide these exemptions if a decent building standard is wanted? That is the question the Government must answer, but it has not done so. Why limit the range of buildings for which builders' licences shall apply if, as the member for Rocky River said, he really wants decent standards?

Mr. Venning: Of course he wants decent standards: he doesn't want to rebuild in a couple of years.

Mr. HUDSON: I take it from what the honourable member has said that he will vote against clause 4 (a) and (b).

Mr. Venning: The man doesn't engage a builder and then close his eyes: he cracks the whip himself.

Mr. HUDSON: If the honourable member accompanied me on a tour of some of the back streets of Adelaide within half a mile of this place, he would see what had happened over the years and what standards of building had applied for factory accommodation. Perhaps tomorrow morning the honourable member could take a walk and see for himself. He would find that many business men were prepared to erect a shoddy building. Buildings of a decent standard have been erected, but this Bill contemplates continuing to allow some business men who want to erect something on the cheap, something shoddy, and have it built by someone not fully competent to build it, to continue to do so. Apart from the direct effect this can have on factory and working conditions generally, it also has an indirect effect on the general standards of the general building industry. As long as incompetence is tolerated, the general standards of this industry will not be good enough. If we are to improve these standards we should remove incompetence wherever it is met.

The redefinition of "building work" seems to be designed to eliminate all maintenance work from being carried out by a licensed builder or tradesman, but the full implications of section 8 of the Building Act have not been considered. That provides certain exemptions. However, under this amendment, if a building is involved in an alteration, an addition or a repair, and plans do not require approval in writing under section 8 of the Building Act, that work is exempt. Under section 8 (11) of the Building Act, if any building is altered, erected, or constructed in accordance

with an order of the Central Board of Health or of a local board of health, or if the building to be erected is to be used exclusively as a greenhouse, a conservatory, a summerhouse or for some similar purpose, then the council may provide a complete exemption from the provisions of section 8.

Mr. Wardle: You have to have a plan, even for a toilet.

Mr. HUDSON: Let me refer the member for Murray to section 8 (11) and (12) of the Building Act. Subsection (12) provides:

The council may from time to time by resolution declare that all persons proposing to erect, construct and to alter any building in any manner or for any purpose referred to in subsection (11) shall be exempt from the obligation to comply with this section . . .

That is, these people do not have to obtain approval in writing, and, that being so, the builder who does the work is excluded from the control of the Builders Licensing Board and does not have to be licensed.

Mr. Wardle: How many would comply with that provision?

Mr. HUDSON: That is irrelevant. The provision exists, and, because of it, if this Bill passes there is a loophole. Section 8 (11), which covers the type of thing concerning which an exemption may be given, includes the erection, construction, addition to or alteration of any building "in accordance with an order of the Central Board of Health or of a local board of health". Therefore, the central or a local board of health gives an order for an alteration to the building, and the council concerned has written in an exemption for the person who will do the work, and that person does not have to be licensed. This is ridiculous. Even though a health matter is involved, where the central or local board of health has power to make an order a building could be exempted entirely from the provisions of the Builders Licensing Act. That is the kind of legislation that this Government is putting up to us!

Mr. Casey: It's crook.

Mr. HUDSON: It's crook, it smells, it stinks; one merely has to name one of those characteristics, and this Bill has it.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I wonder whose convenience this is supposed to meet.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know. I can only assume, however, that it is not that of the master builders, despite what the Minister said in his second reading explanation. Nor do I believe that it meets the convenience of the Housing Industry Association. I believe that there may be certain interests who have

involved themselves in the building industry in recent years without knowing anything about building, who are backing the Liberal and Country League and who want the power to continue to involve themselves in building without being licensed and without being subject to the standards that should apply to anyone involved in this industry.

Mr. Clark: At the expense of the public!

Mr. HUDSON: That is right. Every weakness in this Bill exists at the expense of the public and at the expense of the standards of the industry, as well as at the expense of every competent tradesman engaged in the industry. What happens in the building industry in the periods of difficulty that occur regularly (they have always occurred regularly, and they occur independently of who is in Government at the time)? The incompetent undercuts in order to get business, and he forces unprofitable work on to the competent. Some competent people can be forced out of the industry altogether or into bankruptcy, as happened particularly as a result of the 1960 credit squeeze. In 1961-62 some competent builders and tradesmen were forced out of the industry or into bankruptcy, simply because of the actions of the incompetent people who were in the industry.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Nankivell): Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to new Standing Order 143A, which provides that the person deputed by the Leader of the Opposition to speak in certain matters has unlimited time. Can the honourable member assure me that he has been deputed by the Leader to lead this debate?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. Thank you for your courtesy in pointing out to me that I have unlimited time. I think it is important to recognize that the matter of standards is not just one that interests the ordinary members of the public, although that is enough: after all, the ordinary member of the public these days gets himself involved in the biggest contract of his life, namely, the purchase of a house; and if that house turns out to be shoddy, then not only can the whole capital assets of an individual be wiped out but also the whole life of a family can be adversely affected. Every member ought to know the serious consequences that arise for individuals in our community who are taken in by shoddy building or by an incompetent builder, and they should be concerned not to provide loopholes for the incompetent but to provide proper and sure protection for the ordinary individual. But on top of that,

members should also be concerned to ensure that the competent tradesman or builder is fully protected and that the quality and standard of his work is not undermined by competition from the cheap and the shoddy.

Even the competent person with the highest standards can be forced to lower his standards if his prices are continually being undercut by someone who does something on the cheap and produces a shoddy result. The loopholes in the Act, if the Bill becomes law, will be so wide that the whole aim and purpose of the legislation will be completely destroyed, and we might as well throw it away. Having dealt with various matters, including clause 16, which is the really objectionable part of the Bill and which is designed to provide a loophole for any tradesman or builder who does not want to become licensed, I wish to deal now with some minor matters that I consider deserve comment. Clauses 11 and 12 alter the arrangements of the principal Act wherever a partnership or a body corporate is involved.

Under the principal Act, wherever a partnership or a body corporate was involved in building or in a particular trade, then a member of the board, or a partner in the case of a partnership, had to hold either a general builder's licence or a restricted licence. The amendment proposed in clauses 11 and 12 would exempt from that provision a body corporate or a partnership, where the board was satisfied that a person who held an appropriate licence was engaged to supervise the building work. I think that provision is possible, but I want to reserve judgment on it. It seems to me that, where a company is engaged in a particular building activity and where no member of the board of that company has a general builder's licence, it would still be possible for that company to undertake work of a requisite standard provided that we could specify and ensure all the time that the person supervising any building work had a general builder's licence.

Mr. Hurst: Don't you think the company should be responsible and should not ride on the back of the individual who has the qualifications? This is just a let-out for the "smart alics".

Mr. HUDSON: That may be so, but we have many situations of companies (for instance, Development Finance Corporation Limited, which is engaged in the West Lakes Development Scheme) that are simply general financiers of a building operation. In such cases no-one on the board of the company

has any direct knowledge of building and no one can qualify for a general builder's licence. Consequently, such companies would be prohibited from engaging in any building work unless they put on the board someone who was qualified. I will reserve judgment on this matter.

Mr. Hurst: I have pretty strong views on this.

Mr. HUDSON: It would always be possible for any company that did not have a member of the board who had a general builder's licence to add an additional member to the board and thereby get around the provision of the principal Act. The relevant question is not so much whether a member of the board has the general competence but whether the actual building work is being undertaken by someone who has the competence. At this stage, I think possibly the provisions of clauses 11 and 12 are reasonable, but I want to examine the matter further before giving a final judgment. I am not sure whether the actual provisions of clauses 11 and 12 are tight enough to ensure that in all cases the work being carried out is being properly and adequately supervised.

The Bill also provides a further appeal for anyone who loses a licence by decision of the board. Under the principal Act, the person adversely affected by a decision of the board could appeal only to the Adelaide Local Court, whose decision was final. However, the Bill proposes to introduce a further appeal over and above the Adelaide Local Court. Therefore, someone who loses his licence, if he loses an appeal to the Adelaide Local Court, can take the matter to the Supreme Court. This is in line with the general thinking of the Government, which protects as much as it can those who have the financial backing to appeal, to appeal, and to appeal. In fact, about the only sense in which this Government can be said to be appealing is in its propensity for introducing provisions in legislation to ensure the maximum possible number of appeals that can be made.

I am a little puzzled by the provision in clause 13, which amends section 18 of the principal Act. That section refers to the procedure that must be followed when the holder of a licence has been found by any court or other tribunal, or after due inquiry by the board, to have been negligent or incompetent. The amendment proposed is to substitute for the words "or other tribunal" the words "any duly appointed arbitrator". It seems to me that this is confining the meaning of section 18 in a

way that is probably not necessary. The words "or other tribunal", if my interpretation is correct, would cover the case of "any duly appointed arbitrator", but other tribunals might not come into the category of "any duly appointed arbitrator". Therefore, it appears that clause 13 is designed to narrow the way in which a person can be found to be negligent or incompetent.

Originally, under section 18, that person could be found to be negligent or incompetent in the performance of any building work or other work in the building trade by any court or other tribunal or after due inquiry by the board. Now it is to be by any court or any duly appointed arbitrator or by the board. When we go into Committee (if we go into Committee, because I sincerely hope the Bill will be dealt with at the second reading stage), I will certainly want to know from the Minister why this substitution is necessary. It seems to me that "any duly appointed arbitrator" is covered by the words "or other tribunal" in the principal Act.

Mr. Lawn: He won't give an explanation, will he?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know; he will certainly be here for a long time if he does not. The other provisions of the Bill are minor ones about which there is no objection: they merely do some minor bits of tidying up of language. However, the objectionable things are so objectionable as to require a vote against this Bill at the second reading stage, action in Committee to remove objectionable elements, or a refusal to support the third reading if such objections are not met. It seems to us that the Government has not even attempted to make out a case why people in the industry should not be consulted by the board through the existing advisory committee, and why that provision should not even be given an opportunity to work.

The Government has not made out a case why loop-holes should be provided for certain types of building and building work, and it has not put forward a case for the provisions of clause 16, which are aimed simply at making the Act inoperable, providing a sufficiently wide loop-hole for any builder or tradesman to continue his operations without getting a licence and without any sort of supervision of the quality of his work. In these circumstances, for the Government to claim that it is preserving the original purpose of the Act is laughable. It is destroying the purpose of protecting the house owner and the competent tradesman and builder. Whether or not the

Government recognizes this, it is the effect of the Bill. I oppose the Bill, hoping that all members will see the merit in what I have said and will also oppose the second reading and throw it out.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): When I was able to, I listened with great interest to what the member for Glenelg had to say, and I gathered that he is very much against the Bill.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: That was the impression he tried to convey.

Mr. RODDA: Yes. I have been told by my colleagues that he has referred to the members on this side as 16 cow cockies. I agree with one thing the member for Glenelg said: it is necessary for the house builder and anyone associated with building construction to have an assurance that a satisfactory job will be done. However, I do not agree with his interpretation of the \$500 limit. Recently, I was associated closely in the building of a house for a member of my family and, from some of the accounts that were presented to me, we were not getting very much work done for \$500.

Mr. Virgo: Do you oppose the \$500 limit then?

Mr. RODDA: No, I am merely making an observation despite the description of being a cow cockie. For second fixings or painting of a not terribly big house, \$500 did not go very far. Despite the vicious bark of the member for Glenelg, I am sure that he will receive from the Minister full consideration of his objections at the appropriate time.

Mr. Hudson: The appropriate time is the second reading explanation, and we did not get it.

Mr. RODDA: It is the member's duty to raise such objections on behalf of the people he represents and on behalf of the house builders of the State, and I do not blame him for that. I think his observations were tempered somewhat by the affiliation to which he subscribes, and I do not suppose I can blame him for that, either.

Mr. Langley: I should like to buy your house for \$500.

Mr. RODDA: I do not believe that the member for Unley has understood what I have been talking about.

Mr. Langley: That's what the Bill says.

Mr. RODDA: An unlicensed person is limited to work up to the value of \$500. This type of legislation is necessary in the ordered society in which we live and because a man's home is his castle—and may it always be. Some people in my district have raised issue

with me, wanting to know when the legislation will be proclaimed. The Minister and his officers have gone into this matter thoroughly and I am sure that when we reach the Committee stage the fears expressed by the member for Glenelg will be allayed.

Mr. Langley: How much do you think it would cost to wire a house or to do the plumbing or plastering work?

Mr. RODDA: I never argue with an expert, and I'm not going to argue with one now; but I do not suppose that the member for Unley could tell me the cost of a herd of cows. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) built a tank stand and, although it was knocked down, it was still standing. The member for Stirling has many things to his credit, but I believe that the building of the tank stand will long live in the memories of the initiators of the Bill. When the Bill reaches the Committee stage, I will take issue over certain matters with the member for Glenelg. However, I support the second reading.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): I was hoping that the member for Victoria would provide me with something I could rebut. I suggest to him that he spend at least part of the weekend reading both the Act and the Bill and, if he does not have a copy of the Act, I shall be pleased to let him borrow the one I obtained yesterday from the messengers. It has notes marked in it, so he will be able to follow more easily how the Bill will murder the licensing of builders; there is no other word for it.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It is in simple terms, I hope.

Mr. VIRGO: How more simple need it be? The Act, if amended as the Minister of Housing seeks to have it amended, will be completely useless. If the Minister were honest he would have moved to repeal the Act. By his waffling on, the member for Victoria has shown one thing: he has not the faintest idea of what the Bill seeks to do, and I doubt whether he has troubled even to read the Act.

Mr. Clark: One good thing: his speech was short.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. We should trace the history of the Bill and seek the reason why the Labor Government introduced it in the first place. For years, inferior buildings, particularly houses, were being erected, and all members of this Chamber (perhaps metropolitan members to a greater extent than country members) from time to time have

had directed to their attention faults in houses into which people have sunk their life savings. We all know that there are builders operating in the State today who have no more idea of building a house than of running up to the moon and, because of the commendable action of the former Minister of Housing (Hon. D. A. Dunstan), there is an Act to protect these people; but the present Government has sabotaged the interests of the people of this State by refusing to appoint the advisory committee or to proclaim the Act. So, while there is an Act designed to protect the interests of people who have put their life savings into a house, the Government has been found guilty, by the jury of the people of South Australia, of failing to protect their interests. It is not an act of omission: it is a deliberate act because, as you know, Mr. Speaker, since members on this side were forced out of office by the rotten electoral system, despite the wishes of the people, we have consistently urged the Minister of Housing to state his intention in this matter.

Members can read in *Hansard* the ambiguous and very often contradictory replies given by the Minister of Housing to questions that have been asked on this matter. It is obvious to all concerned that the Minister, with the concurrence of all members of his Government, has connived to defeat the objective of this legislation. When the Minister introduced the Bill a short time ago the fears that many of us had had were, unfortunately, fulfilled, because here within this Bill we have the complete and utter destruction of the licensing provisions. It is just so much poppycock for the Minister to say, as he said in his second reading explanation, that the real essence or the basis of this Act, namely, the licensing part of it, was being preserved. That is utter rubbish.

Mr. Jennings: They opposed it in its entirety to begin with.

Mr. VIRGO: If members of the Government were honest, just for once in their lives, they would be moving for the repeal of this legislation. However, they have not got the courage of their convictions. Also, they know the feelings of the public and of the building industry on the matter. When I say that, I am not just confining my remarks to the trade union section of the building industry: I am talking also about the employers in the industry. Members of this Government, for reasons best known to themselves, are embarking on a course of destruction. The Attorney-General can frown all he likes; he looks no more

handsome when he is frowning than when he has that Colgate smile.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I don't know what you mean.

Mr. VIRGO: The Attorney-General's comment shows that, like the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda), he has not taken the trouble to read either the Act or the Bill. One wonders, in view of the statement by the Attorney-General, what sort of consideration was given to this matter by Cabinet. He is a member of the Cabinet, and I always thought that Bills went before Cabinet. In fact, the Minister of Housing, when replying to a Dorothy Dixier question on August 12 from the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans), said:

Yesterday Cabinet authorized the drafting of amendments to the Act.

Yet the Attorney-General does not seem to know what is going on in Cabinet.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I said that I did not understand what you were saying.

Mr. VIRGO: I thought I was using single syllable words, and I will use them again: this Bill is murdering the Builders Licensing Act. If the Government and the Attorney-General and all of his colleagues were honest, they would be moving to repeal the Act, not just doing something to make it an innocuous document that will have no value at all and will not achieve the purposes for which it was originally designed. I draw the attention of the House to a statement issued four years ago by the Master Builders Association, which I believe has a right to be heard and to have its point of view considered. The statement is as follows:

The first submission to a South Australian Government was to the Premier in a deputation of 1939.

That was 30 years ago, at a time when the Master Builders Association of Western Australia was successful in having legislation on the registration of builders introduced in that State. We often hear the Premier talking about how people are flocking to Western Australia from this State. Even though it is claimed in the statements of the Premier to be a backward State compared with South Australia, it had the licensing of builders 30 years ago. We got it two years ago, but it was never allowed by this Government to operate, and now this Government, by putting an axe into it, is making sure that it never will operate. The submission of the Master Builders Association goes on to say:

The second submission was made to the Premier in 1945 by a deputation in which the Master Builders Association was joined by the

Municipal and Metropolitan Councils Association, the South Australian Institute of Architects and other representative bodies. The third approach was made to the Premier in 1947 through the Liberal and Country League.

Needless to say, none of these approaches was successful. The submission goes on:

The fourth approach was jointly made with the Municipal Association seeking amendments to the Building Act to provide for registration. That was in 1952, and that approach, too, was unsuccessful. The Master Builders Association, the Municipal Association, the Institute of Architects and all the other bodies that support registration had to wait for a Labor Government to take action. It is regrettable (and I fear that it will go down in history) that although the Labor Government was successful in getting the Bill through the House it was not successful in getting it through in time for it to become operative; it was forced out by the rotten electoral system that we suffer in South Australia.

Mr. Jennings: It went through the Legislative Council.

Mr. VIRGO: Well, of course, the Act as it now stands is not the same as the Bill that was introduced and passed by this House: it is the product of a compromise that we reached after a conference with that autocratic organization known as the Legislative Council. The need for adequate protection for people purchasing or building homes must surely be self-evident. If any member of the Government who comes from the country is not directly familiar with some of the gerry-building that is going on, any member on this side will be only too pleased to escort him around and show him where walls are out of plumb, where some ceilings are 2in. or 3in. away from the walls, and where there are cracks right up a wall after a house has been built for only six or 12 months. Any member on this side will show him floors that are sunken, as well as other fundamental faults. We are trying to prevent these things from happening, but the Bill ensures that they will never be provided for.

Mr. McAnaney: Why don't you include the Housing Trust?

Mr. VIRGO: This Act should apply to everyone, which includes South Australian Government departments.

Mr. McAnaney: Why don't you put it in the Bill?

Mr. Jennings: It's your Bill.

Mr. VIRGO: I thought we were debating a Bill introduced by the Minister of Housing, a measure that wrecks beyond recognition the existing Act that this Government has not

proclaimed. I think the member for Stirling and the member for Victoria ought to do more study. If they do, they will not make such stupid remarks as they have made. All members know that at least one Government member (and I refer to the member for Onkaparinga) opposes entirely the registration of builders. He has said that in this House, and I strongly suspect that he has 18 colleagues who are not as honest but have the same opinion. Otherwise, this Bill would not have been introduced. Perhaps that honourable member did not write a letter to the press, but I think a letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* published on August 7, from the Executive Director of the Master Builders Association (Mr. K. C. West) merits the attention of the House. That letter states:

I refer to the reported statement of Mr. Evans, M.P. (the *Advertiser*, August 6, 1969) in which he displays an astonishing lack of knowledge of the building industry.

Mr. Venning: He'd know more about it than you, anyway.

Mr. VIRGO: I am pleased to hear that comment, because I hope that the member for Rocky River joins the member for Onkaparinga and displays his expert knowledge in this field. I am sure the House would be delighted to hear that. I hope what he says has more sense than the statements by the Minister and the member for Victoria have had.

Mr. McAnaney: We'll take you to the house that the member for Onkaparinga built, without having a licence.

Mr. VIRGO: Probably, if I had been able to fleece the public like the member for Onkaparinga had been, I would be able to build a house just as well. I have worked for every "bob" I have.

Mr. RODDA: I take exception to the remark that the member for Onkaparinga has been fleecing the public, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Objection having been taken to the words used by the member for Edwardstown, I ask the honourable member to withdraw those words.

Members interjecting:

Mr. VIRGO: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but because of the hurly-burly that is going on, I am not sure what words you are asking me to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! Objection has been taken by the member for Victoria to the statement by the member for Edwardstown that the member for Onkaparinga was fleecing the

public. Those are the words to which objection has been taken and I ask the honourable member to withdraw them.

Mr. VIRGO: Out of deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to cause uproar in the House and, if the member for Victoria objects, I will withdraw. It is strange that the member for Onkaparinga is not objecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Edwardstown, having complied with the Speaker's ruling, is now entitled to be heard.

Mr. VIRGO: Mr West's letter continues:

For the information of those who might be misled by Mr. Evans' admittedly personal views, the facts are:

That anyone can start in business as a builder. No qualifications are presently needed. The Builders Licensing Act provides for suitable qualifications. That the home-building field provides the largest volume of construction work, and it is to this field that the least-skilled operative is attracted. That members of the public are usually so anxious to get their home built that they are wide open to exploitation and inferior workmanship.

These people are also being fleeced. Mr. West continues:

That such exploitation does take place is a matter of record—in other words, we do have "faulty housing"—and the implication in Mr. Evans' statement that neither the inspectors of local councils nor the inspectors of lending authorities are able to exercise effective control of jobs is hard to swallow. That technical competence is demanded of architects, electricians and plumbers. That, in providing for suitable qualifications, the Act gives the buying public some guarantee that the contractor has sufficient skill and responsibility to carry out his obligations.

For these reasons we believe that the Builders Licensing Act does provide a protection for the public which does not, at present, exist. We also believe that it should lead to an improvement in standards. In respect of the allegation that the Act is designed to bring about a "closed shop", we draw Mr. Evans' attention to the fact that every member of the Master Builders Association's registration of builders committee was a former apprentice and skilled tradesman, and that the greatest care was taken that a skilled tradesman, with suitable experience in the industry, should be able to commence in business as a builder.

The only question is whether the Act is workable in its present form. We believe that certain amendments are necessary. The Housing Minister (Mr. Pearson) also believes that certain amendments are necessary, and has stated in the House that these amendments have been drafted and are before Cabinet. For this reason we have, until now, deliberately refrained from public comment. Under the circumstances, we can only regret that a member of the Government should not have shown the same respect to Cabinet, but has

chosen to make such ill-informed, ill-timed and misleading statements.

The Executive Director of the association has summed up accurately the so-called expert knowledge of the member for Onkaparinga to which the member for Stirling has referred. The member for Victoria referred to the limit of \$500 imposed by this Bill. Under the present provisions of section 21 (4) (b) it is possible for a person to undertake work, provided it is painting only, to the extent of \$100 without first acquiring or holding a licence, and if it is other work the value is \$250. This Bill increases this amount to \$500 in all cases.

Mr. Langley: The member for Victoria didn't know that.

Mr. VIRGO: I hope that he will learn. Surely Government members realize how a house is built today. Contracts are not let as they used to be: they are not let to a builder who proceeds from the beginning to the end with his own staff. I am speaking now of house construction. We have some of the lowest characters in this country, namely, land agents, who hold themselves out as builders, but they do not have the faintest idea how to lay a brick and would not know the difference between a load of gravel and a load of tiles. They do not build a house: they just rake in the profits. These land agents, who are sharks, thieves, and robbers, sell a block of land to a person on condition that he signs a contract for the agreement to erect the house within a certain time.

They receive the profits in two ways: first, from the sale of land and, secondly, from the construction of the house. They let subcontracts to build the house and they make a profit on every one. When one of these rotten land agents decides to build a house he lets a contract for the foundation: is that \$500? We all know it is not, except in isolated cases of steeply sloping land or for a mansion. It would have to be more than 1,400 squares and on a sloping block to cost \$500 for the foundations. The Government is trying to exempt foundation contractors. What is the good of a house that is not built on a proper foundation? It would be as shaky as are the present State and Commonwealth Liberal Governments. There have been more subcontracts let for under \$500 for brickwork than for over \$500, particularly with the advent of brick-veneer houses. The carpenter comes in for the first fixings, and even the Minister of Housing began to get some semblance of

the message that the work could be done for under \$500. The tiling is under \$500; so is the plumbing; and so are carpenter's second fixings. I doubt whether there would be any subcontract that would be more than \$500 today.

Effectively, this Bill is exempting from registration all builders engaged in house construction, yet these are the people that it was desired should be controlled when this legislation was first introduced. If the Minister of Housing and other members of Cabinet were honest they would try to repeal the Act, not to amend it in this way. Let us consider the quaint clause that the Minister intends to insert to provide that a person need not have a licence to build a house or dwelling for another person if, before it is constructed, he receives a letter from the person stating that he intends it for his personal use and occupation. What a hypocritical clause! All a shonky builder and some shonky land agents have to do is to say to some people, "It is worth \$50 if you write to me saying that you want me to build a house for you. There is no requirement that you must live in it, but all you have to do is to let me have a letter to say that it is intended for you. If you change your mind it does not matter, because you are not required to live in it."

We are getting down into the absolute depths of degradation with this type of rotten legislation on this important matter. I do not think that some Government members realize the importance of this legislation. I do not wish harm to anyone, but I wish that Government members had purchased one of these houses, after using their life savings, and then found that it crumbled around their ears. Perhaps they would be more sympathetic then. Obviously, they are untouched at present by other people's worries. I wonder how many Government members have considered clause 4, which seeks to amend the definition of "building" and "building work". This means that the meaning of "building", instead of being all-embracing as it is now, will be watered down. The exemptions were purely a sop to primary producers, because the only buildings exempted were those intended to be used solely for the business of primary production. The Government is not going to stop at that. It is going to include, in addition to buildings for primary production, any building consisting only or mainly of assembled prefabricated metal sections or any timber frame building where such building is not intended for residential purposes.

This means that every industrial building other than one of brick construction is now going to be exempt from the Builders Licensing Act, so that a person, carrying on the business of building, can concentrate on timber frame construction.

We all know that there are far more wood and iron or steel factories today than anything else, and the Government is effectively exempting every one of these buildings from the Act. It means that even one of the Government members could go out and try to erect a factory; provided he uses not bricks but prefabricated steel or timber, there is no requirement of licence. Again, I am wondering how many Government members have gone into a factory. If they had visited factories, they would realize that the standard factory construction is a building with a saw-tooth roof, consisting of prefabricated steel members. These buildings are now all exempt if the Bill is passed. Not satisfied that he has really wrecked the Act, the Minister has gone even further: he has deleted the definition of "building work" and has put in his own definition.

It is a pretty clever piece of drafting on his part (undoubtedly, the Draftsman has acted under instructions from the Minister), and it is designed to whittle down further the provisions of the Act to ensure that alterations, additions and repairs are completely deleted. Apparently, the Government believes that a person can go around erecting steel and wooden frame buildings of all descriptions, other than houses, without there being any restriction at all. It is unbelievable, as I have said, that the Government can descend so low as to try to camouflage retaining the provisions of the legislation by so effectively destroying its very function. I wish to read a letter that I received only this morning. I am sure (indeed, I hope) that all members of Parliament have received correspondence from the various sections of the building industry. This morning I received a second letter from the Fibrous Plaster and Ceiling Contractors Association, which states:

I can assure you that whatever can be done by myself, or my association, to further the cause in keeping the proposed amendment figure of the Builders Licensing Act at the lower figure, will be done with a maximum effort, as all my members are unanimous in their opinion, with yourself, that this Act is being murdered, and that all pressure should be brought to bear, on all Parliamentarians, that with this Act the lower figure prevails.

Is the Government not concerned that members of such an organization are unanimous in

their opposition to the Bill? Surely Government members have received similar letters. I wish to deal now with the deletion of the provisions associated with the advisory committee. As soon as the Minister showed his hand and said that the advisory committee would not be retained, he showed conclusively that he did not intend to leave the legislation in a workable form. We all know that it cannot work effectively under the board.

I am not trying to criticize the persons who have been appointed to this board: it would be very good—if it had the necessary teeth. On the board will be a legal practitioner, a member of the South Australian Chapter of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, a member of the Australian Institute of Building, a member of the Institute of Chartered Accountants, and a member of the Institution of Engineers. However, workers in the building industry are not represented on the board. No licensing scheme will function unless the voice of the people concerned is heard, and their voice could have been heard through the advisory committee. So, why has the Govern-

ment abolished it? The committee has never transgressed, because it has never functioned.

Slightly more than half the members of the advisory committee were appointed by the Labor Government before it went out of office, but the present Government did absolutely nothing to make the other appointments. I agree with the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) that the Government is showing its venom for the trade union movement. Anything that has any suggestion of trade unionism will be bitterly opposed by this Government, for it considers the trade union movement to be its arch-enemy. When the occasion next arises and trade unionists have an opportunity to show whether they are friends or enemies of the present Government, I believe that the Government will learn that these people bitterly oppose its backward thinking. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.41 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 11, at 2 p.m.